

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,176	01/29/2001	James A. Proctor JR.	2479.2071-000	1093
²⁴³⁷⁴ VOLPE AND I	7590 05/03/200 KOENIG, P.C.	7	EXAMINER	
DEPT. ICC UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600 30 SOUTH 17TH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			BURD, KEVIN MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•	•	05/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/772,176	PROCTOR, JAMES A.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kevin M. Burd	2611				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI , cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 Fe	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2007.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.[D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims		•				
4) Claim(s) 1,2,5-22 and 25-42 is/are pending in t	the application					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	* *					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,5-22,25-42</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers	•					
··· _	ır.					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	,					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<u> </u>		2442()()				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents		Novello de la Nic				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	·	received in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	rossivad				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not	received.				
	,					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application						

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

6) Other: ___

Art Unit: 2611

1. This office action, in response to the amendment filed 2/13/2007, is a non-final office action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 5-22 and 25-42 have been considered but are most in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 2, 5-22 and 25-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter et al (US 6,977,912) in view of Kraiem et al (US 6,370,369).

Regarding claims 1, 2, 21, 22, 41 and 42, Porter discloses a communication system and a method of communicating between a base station and subscriber terminals shown in figure 1. The subscriber terminal monitors a channel and generates one or more channel metrics. The generated metrics are communicated back to the cell access point over a signaling channel and a new frequency is allocated to the cell if it is determined from the metrics that the presently allocated channel is suffering interference (abstract). The subscriber terminal can determine the location and velocity of the interferers (column 11, lines 1-10). Though, Porter discloses the wireless

Application/Control Number: 09/772,176

Art Unit: 2611

communication network is arranged in a cellular configuration (column 1, lines 12-20), Porter does not disclose the subscriber terminals are-mobile. Kraiem discloses a wireless network comprising mobile terminals shown in figure 3. The mobile terminals allow the users to move to various locations throughout a cell as well as being able to directly communicate with one another without using a central station or access point as a repeater (column 1, lines 5-10). For these reasons, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the subscriber terminals of Kraiem into the communication system and method of communicating of Porter.

Regarding claims 5-7 and 25-27, Porter further discloses the metrics are computed from the coding gain (column 9, lines 13-27).

Regarding claims 8-13 and 28-33, Porter further discloses the metrics are calculated according to errors in the received transmissions (column 8, lines 30-60).

Regarding claims 14 and 34, Porter discloses the control server will collect the information regarding the calculated metrics and execute frequency reassignment when necessary (column 8, lines 21-24).

Regarding claims 18-20 and 38-40, the modulation attributes measured are discloses in column 8, lines 30-60.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2611

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 15-17 and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter et al (US 6,977,912) in view of Kraiem et al (US 6,370,369) further in view of McNicol et al (US 5,940,454).

Regarding claims 15-17 and 35-37, the combination of Porter and Kraiem discloses the communication system and a method of communicating between a base station and subscriber terminals stated above. The combination does not disclose changing an antenna mode in response to the metrics. McNicol discloses a receiver, shown in figure 5, responsive to a quality metric that controls the selection of the antenna (abstract). The antennas may be omni directional or sectored (column 9, lines 5-13). McNicol overcomes channel fading and channel distortion (column 3, lines 24-29) to allow the received signals to be received with less errors. For this reason, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of McNicol into the communication system of the combination of Porter and Kraiem.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin M. Burd whose telephone number is (571) 272-3008. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9 am - 5 pm.

Application/Control Number: 09/772,176

Art Unit: 2611

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kevin M. Burd 4/30/2007

KEVIN BURD PRIMARY EXAMINER